

Palæontologist to the Geological Survey of Canada, and two from the Museum of the Geological Society of London.

After giving a brief notice of the deposits from which the nodules containing these crustacean fossils have been derived, and the authors who have written upon them, Dr. Woodward describes (1) a new *Callianassa*, which he names *Callianassa Whiteavesii*; (2) an anomalous Brachyuran, which he names *Homolopsis Richardsoni*; (3) a new Corystid, named *Palæocorystes Harveyi*; and (4) a new Cancer, named *Plagiolophus vancouverensis*.

2. 'On a Fossil Octopus, *Calais Newboldi* (J. de C. Sby., MS.), from the Cretaceous of the Lebanon.' By Henry Woodward, LL.D., F.R.S., P.G.S.

The specimen to which the Author's attention was obligingly drawn by Mr. C. Davies Sherborn, F.G.S., is in the Museum of the Geological Society; it was obtained by Major T. J. Newbold, and named in 1846 in MS. by the late Mr. J. de Carle Sowerby, *Calais Newboldii*, who added on the label:—'Ceph. Octopoda. Genus ineditum. Abdomen alis triangularibus instructum. E strato calcareo tertiaro Montis Libani a D. Newbould effossum.—1846. J. de Carle Sowerby.'

The Author describes the specimen in detail, and retains for it the genus and species proposed by Mr. Sowerby, only correcting the spelling of the discoverer's name and the age of the bed, which is Cretaceous, not Tertiary.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The imputed Jealousy of European Workers on Australasian Faunas by Local Writers. By C. HEDLEY, F.L.S.

REFERRING to the controversy in the last August and October numbers of this Magazine, touching the synonymy of *Rhysota Armiti*, I can readily accept the decision of Mr. Smith, since he has the advantage over me of consulting a figure. While the identity of a species may be held a trifling matter, his concluding remark that American and Australian naturalists jealously resent the interference of European writers with their respective local fauna, touches on a topic so large and important that I would crave space to discuss it further.

When such interference takes the shape of the splendid 'Challenger' monographs it is received most thankfully; but when it comes to us, as it often does—I am, of course, not now alluding to Mr. Smith—in papers ignoring Australian or American literature, without, or with mistaken, reference to geographical, geological, and other environment necessary to the proper appreciation of the subject, and presenting data insufficient for the recognition of the species dealt with, then we may be ungrateful without being jealous. Even resentment may be provoked by the flippant manner in which Australian and some American work is received, no matter how

honestly attempted, by the disregard of our scientific literature and by the shameful ignorance that pervades all classes in matters concerned with Australian geography.

An apt parable is the story of two children dividing a piece of bread and jam, of whom the elder licked off the sweets and handed to the younger the dry bread for his share. What credit may attach to the naming of species is appropriated by some Europeans, who leave the drier crust of classification, anatomy, distribution, &c. to be laboriously worked out by others.

To support these charges by particulars, I will wander no further than the source whence this discussion arose. Some years ago I prepared an account of the Land-Molluscan Fauna of British New Guinea, in studying which I encountered several unfigured descriptions by Mr. Smith. A London writer, who has at his command the ablest men, the wealthiest museums, and most complete libraries in the world, cannot appreciate the difficulties under which an American, and still more an Australian, student pursues his work in a city far from civilization's centre, poorly equipped with books, specimens, or apparatus, and alone from fellow-workers. If Mr. Smith, who can identify almost any known shell by a glance at an authentic specimen in his official custody, could realize how the head of one student of his writings has ached in reading and re-reading one of his brief unfigured diagnoses and in endeavouring to match it with a specimen in hand, he would never, I believe, again issue an unfigured description. Chance, however, later threw in my path authentic examples of Mr. Smith's unfigured Papuan species; and, though I consider it unfair for one writer to cast upon another the burden of completing his work, I published drawings of each of them.

My satisfaction in reducing this fauna to order was short-lived, for Mr. Smith then produced a series of papers in which a considerable number of New-Guinea species were named and described without figures or precise localities. Now I do not regard the publication of these descriptions as a mere formal rite whose celebration invests British-Museum specimens with the rank of type; but I receive them as an intended aid to Australian students in the study of their local fauna. Yet a perusal of them does not enable me to project a distinct image of any of the forms dealt with; nor am I alone in this infirmity, for one of the most striking of these shells has since been renamed, described, and figured as an unpublished species by a German author, Dr. Kobelt. Several of the species are relegated to the genus *Helix*, which, in the sense Mr. Smith employed it, contains about three thousand species; he also draws specific limits narrower than do some other writers. For the purpose of this argument it is granted that, in adopting broad genera and narrow species, the best course is followed; but it will then be obvious that he who contrasts a novelty with thousands instead of scores of co-generic forms, and he who sees five species where another distinguishes three, is under the greater necessity of giving full details than he who adopts the alternative course. Concholo-

gists have especial reasons for figuring every shell described, inasmuch as that shell is not a complete organism, such as usually represents a species to an entomologist or an ichthyologist. If a carcinologist were required to name and describe a new crab from an empty carapace shorn of its appendages, or a botanist to publish a new tree from a handful of leaves, each would probably decline on the ground of insufficient material; and if he yielded, say to the impertunity of a palæontologist who could furnish nothing else, he would endeavour to make amends for his fragmentary material by figuring and describing it in the minutest detail.

To conclude: in the army of science there is no room between an honoured veteran like Mr. Smith and a tyro like myself for that green-eyed monster to whom he somewhat harshly alludes. The object of these remarks will have been attained if I can but induce European writers to read a little more Australian scientific literature, to study the geography of this continent with a little more care, and especially to figure every Australasian shell they describe as new.

Sydney, New South Wales,
November 30, 1895.

Reply.

I do not propose in any way to modify or withdraw the opinion expressed in the paragraph of my paper complained of by Mr. Hedley, who has, however, both *misunderstood* and *misrepresented* it. I make no general imputation against *all* Americans, as he infers, but, from my own experience and from the testimony of others, I have reason to know that a jealous feeling has been entertained by "some."

With regard to the title of Mr. Hedley's above remarks, I would observe that I have made no accusation at all against Australian writers, and my observation, "it seems almost as if the 'green-eyed monster' were tripping in the Antipodes," was a playful reference to Mr. Hedley alone, and was prompted by the general tone of his paper, which I thought might have been withheld until he had again occasion to deal with the fauna of New Guinea. I may add that if he had been a little less precipitate he would have been saved the trouble of writing his comments, for figures have since been published of the species complained of.

I may also say, in conclusion, that I do not think it would be edifying to further encroach upon the valuable space of these 'Annals' with a detailed criticism of the rest of Mr. Hedley's prolix remarks. A deal might be said with regard to the relative value of a good description and a bad figure, of the cost of illustration, of priority of publication, &c., but *cui bono*?
E. A. SMITH.

P.S.—Since penning the above reply specimens of Mr. Hedley's *Rhysota flyensis* (a synonym of which he complained of my creation in *R. Armiti*) have been added to the Museum collection. In my opinion it is *merely a variety* of his own *R. hercules*, described at the same time!—E. A. S.